PROBLEM OF TIME IN SLIGHTLY INHOMOGENEOUS COSMOLOGY

Edward Anderson

DAMTP Cambridge, ea212 *at* cam.ac.uk

Abstract

The Problem of Time (PoT) is a multi-faceted conceptual incompatibility between various areas of Theoretical Physics. Whilst usually stated as between GR and QM, in fact 8/9ths of it is already present at the classical level. Thus we adopt a 'top down' classical and then quantum approach. I consider a local resolution to the Problem of Time that is Machian, which was previously realized for relational triangle and minisuperspace models. This resolution has three levels: classical, semiclassical and combined semiclassical–histories–records. This article's specific model is a slightly inhomogeneous cosmology considered for now at the classical level. This is motivated by how the inhomogeneous fluctuations that underlie structure formation – galaxies and CMB hotspots – might have been seeded by quantum cosmological fluctuations, as magnified by some inflationary mechanism. In particular, I consider perturbations about $\mathbb{S}^3$ case of this up to second order – which has a number of parallels with the Halliwell-Hawking model but has a number of conceptual differences and useful upgradings. The article's main features are that the elimination part of the model's thin sandwich is straightforward, but the modewise constraints manage to be second-class. Thus the elimination part only arises as an intermediate geometry between superspace and Riem. The reduced geometries have surprising singularities influenced by the matter content of the universe, though the N-body problem anticipates these with its collinear singularities. I also give a 'basis set' of Kuchař beables for this model arena.

arXiv:1403.7583v1 [gr-qc] 29 Mar 2014

1 Introduction

The Problem of Time (PoT) [1, 2, 3, 4] is a multi-faceted conceptual incompatibility between various areas of Theoretical Physics. Whilst usually stated as between GR and QM, in fact 8/9ths of it is already present at the classical level [5]. Thus we adopt a 'top down' classical and then quantum approach. Moreover, we arrive there by considering the conceptually and philosophically interesting case of background-independent physical theories [5], which have the PoT as a consequence. The quantum version of the PoT is more severe, the almost-complete classical manifestation of the problem is expected to be a useful precursor as regards the form, and resolution, of the quantum version of the problem.

We begin with the Temporal Relationalism facet of the PoT. Temporal Relationalism is the root of the well-known quantum-level Frozen Formalism Problem of the Wheeler–DeWitt equation [6, 7]. This root is already classically present; it is the Leibnizian idea that there is no meaningful notion of time for the universe as a whole. Sec 2 then covers the following.
1) Temporal Relationalism can be mathematically implemented by manifest reparametrization invariance, manifest parametrization irrelevance, or geometrical actions that happen to be dual to the latter [8, 9, 10, 11, 4, 12].
2) Temporal Relationalism leads directly to the Hamiltonian constraint $\mathcal{H}$. Thus it leads to the frozen formalism problem manifesting Wheeler–DeWitt equation $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}\Psi = 0$ at the quantum level. [This is to be contrasted with the time-dependent Schrödinger equation and other time-dependent quantum wave equations.]
3) The primarily timeless situation is resolved at the classical level along the lines of Mach's time Principle – time is to be abstracted from change $\mathrm{d}Q^{\mathsf{A}}$ (for configurations Q^{A} which form the configuration space $\mathfrak{q}$). This is in a manner that extends the concept of the astronomers' ephemeris time [13].

Sec 3 then considers Configurational Relationalism: a group $\mathfrak{G}$ of physically irrelevant transformations acting upon $\mathfrak{q}$. This is to be implemented by corrections to the changes (deparametrized velocities). One then extremizes the action with respect to the $\mathfrak{G}$ auxiliaries (known as 'Best Matching' [14, 4], which is a type of reduction). Moreover, the output of this extremization features in the expression for t^{em} for theories with nontrivial $\mathfrak{G}$.

Minisuperspace does not manifest nontrivial Configurational Relationalism, but relational particle mechanics (RPM) does [14, 4], as follows. Its action is

$$S = 2\int \sqrt{WT}\mathrm{d}\lambda \ , \quad W := E - V(\boldsymbol{q}) \ , \quad T := M_{iIjJ} \circ_{A,B} q^{iI} \circ_{A,B} q^{jJ}/2 \ , \quad \circ_{\underline{A},\underline{B}} \underline{q}^I := \dot{\underline{q}} - \dot{\underline{A}} - \dot{\underline{B}} \times \underline{q}^I \ , \tag{1}$$

Here W is the 'potential factor', with constituent parts V the potential energy and E the total energy. T is the kinetic term, built out of the kinetic metric (alias in this case mass matrix) $M_{iIjJ} = \delta_{IJ}\delta_{ij}m_I$ and the best-matching derivative $\circ_{\underline{A},\underline{B}}$ with respect to the translational auxiliary $\underline{A}$ and the rotational auxiliary $\underline{B}$. Underlining denotes spatial vector (also lower-case latin indices, whereas upper-case ones denote particle labels), and bold font denotes configuration space quantity (here possessing both of these types of indices). Then varying with respect to $\underline{A}$ gives the zero total momentum constraint $\underline{P} := \sum_I \underline{p}_I = 0$, and with respect to $\underline{B}$ gives the zero total angular momentum constraint $\underline{L} := \sum_I \underline{q}^I \times \underline{p}_I = 0$. Best Matching then involves solving the velocity formulation of these constraints for the extremal values of $\underline{A}$ and $\underline{B}$ themselves. In 2-d these can be entirely solved for [4] (in 3-d they can be solved for *locally*, meaning away from the physically bona fide collinear configurations for which, nonetheless, the configuration space geometry becomes singular).

For full GR, $\mathfrak{q}$ = Riem(Σ): the space of positive-definite 3-metrics on a fixed spatial topology Σ, and $\mathfrak{g}$ = Diff(Σ): the corresponding diffeomorphisms. Best Matching here then involves solving the so-called Thin Sandwich Problem [15, 10, 16]: solving the linear momentum constraint for the GR shift with spatial metric h_{ab} and its label-time velocity $\dot{h}_{ab}$ as data on a spatial hypersurface Σ. The Thin Sandwich [Fig 1.b)] is the infinitesimal limit of the thick sandwich [Fig 1.a)], and features as a second facet of the PoT [1]. Fig 1.c) recasts this in Best Matching form, which is more general over the set of theories [e.g. Fig 1.d) exhibits the corresponding Best Matching for the RPM triangle]. This Thin Sandwich Problem is in general a major unsolved problem [16]; however, the current Article, demonstrates that it is surmountable for the practically relevant subcase of GR that is slightly inhomogeneous cosmology. Since slightly inhomogeneous quantum cosmology is a case of considerable interest (see below), this adds substantial value to quantum gravity schemes [4, 17, 18] that require Thin Sandwich/Best Matching resolution at an early stage.

Note that the above Lagrange multiplier implementation of Configurational Relationalism (rooted in conventional Principles of Dynamics practise) spoils Temporal Relationalism. This is resolved by a more careful choice of Configurational Relationalism's auxiliaries [19, 4], as per Sec 3. Take this as a first indication that attempted resolutions of individual PoT facets have a great tendency to interfere with each other [1, 4, 20]. See [12, 20] for a full modification of the Principles of Dynamics to be compatible with Temporal Relationalism. That is the amount of work it takes to make even just a classical framework in which the other PoT facets can be formulated and strategically addressed without losing one's resolution of just one other facet.



Figure 1: a) Thick sandwich and its thin-sandwich limit b). The data are as given and the problems to solve are for the spacetime in each shaded region. c) Thin sandwich recast as a case of Best Matching. d) RPM triangle case of Best Matching. For d) one considers two triangles, keeping one fixed whilst shuffling the other around using rotations Rot and translations Tr until maximal congruence is attained. For c) one considers two spatial geometries, keeping one fixed whilst shuffling the other around with spatial diffeomorphisms Diff(Σ).

This Article's model – slightly inhomogeneous cosmology – combines features of minisuperspace and RPM into one arena, and with the added benefit of being more cosmologically realistic than either model. We set this model up in Secs 4 (configurations), 5 (the model's $\mathfrak{q}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$) and 6 (the model's relational action). Slightly inhomogeneous cosmology is a perturbative treatment about some minisuperspace. In particular, this Article considers a second-order perturbation treatment about the spatially isotropic $\mathbb{S}^3$ model with a single minimally-coupled scalar field. This shares many features with Halliwell and Hawking's [21] model; differences from this due to relationalism being followed in this Article are laid out in Secs 2 to 6. I choose this model for the following reasons.

1) Closed models are Machian, $\Sigma = \mathbb{S}^3$ is the simplest case, and the most conventional for closed-universe cosmologies.

2) One needs at least 2 degrees of freedom for relational physics. [The relational minimum is that one physical quantity evolves in terms of another].

3) Cosmology conventionally makes use of scalar fields. The simplest case is one scalar field. It is not hard to extend to n scalar fields as regards this Article's considerations. A cosmological constant term is needed [22] to support the closed spatially-$\mathbb{S}^3$ homogeneous isotropic Friedmann–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker (FLRW) cosmology with scalar field matter in the case with matter effects are presumed small . Slightly inhomogeneous cosmology matters foremost due to how the inhomogeneous fluctuations that underlie structure formation [21, 23, 24] – galaxies and CMB hotspots – might have been seeded by quantum cosmological fluctuations, as magnified by some inflationary mechanism [25]. Moreover, this particularly practically relevant setting suffices to manifests all facets of the Problem of Time (PoT). The constraints underlying many of these facets are provided in Sec 7 for the above model, with the indirect formulation of its Machian classical emergent time in Sec 8, and the sandwich equation and its aforementioned successful solution in Sec 9.

I next name the remaining PoT facets; see the Section ascribed to each for the facet's meaning plus the specific example of that facet in slightly inhomogeneous cosmology. Constraint Closure [26] (Sec 10), Expression in terms of Beables [27] (Sec 11), Spacetime Relationalism (Sec 12), Foliation Independence (Sec 13) [28, 29] and Spacetime Reconstruction [11, 12] (Sec 14). Minisuperspace is trivial as regards the Configurational Relationalism, Constraint Closure, Foliation Dependence and Spacetime Reconstruction facets of the PoT. On the other hand, RPM is trivial for the Spacetime Relationalism and Reconstruction and Foliation Dependence facets. Slightly inhomogeneous cosmology, however, is motivated by having all nine facets non-trivial [I demonstrate the eight of them that occur at the classical level in this Article.] Thus this model arena serves as the successor of both of minisuperspace and RPM's qualitative insights into the PoT. Further successes in resolving this model include: understanding the degrees of freedom count and constraint algebra, and providing a 'basis set' of Kuchař beables for this model. [In contrast with observables being quantities that *are observed*, beables are quantities that just *are*. This is more appropriate for Cosmology and/or closed-system QM [30].] Sec 15 conciudes with this work's frontiers, including an outline of these results' quantum counterparts.

2 Temporal Relationalism

As regards implementing Temporal Relationalism, actions are constructed as follows.

i) They are not to contain any extraneous times or extraneous time-like variables.

[This is a necessary *pre-requisite*, common to all three variants of the *main* implementation discussed below. To be clear about the nature of the extraneous entities excluded, Newtonian time is an example of extraneous time and the Arnowitt–Deser–Misner (ADM) lapse of GR α is an example of extraneous time-like variable.]

ii) Time is not to be smuggled into the action in the guise of a label either.

Then a first formulation of ii) is for a label to be present but physically meaningless because it can be changed for any other (monotonically related) label without changing the physical content of the theory. I.e. the action in question is to be *manifestly reparametrization-invariant*.

Via its use of a label time λ, this is a relatively conventional presentation. Then for instance a primary notion of velocity can defined as the derivative with respect to λ:

$$\text{velocity} := \text{d(configuration variable)/d(label time) i.e. } \mathrm{d}Q^{\mathsf{A}}/\mathrm{d}\lambda \ . \tag{2}$$

Next, one can straightforwardly build the kinetic term $T := ||\mathsf{O}\boldsymbol{Q}||_{\boldsymbol{M}}{}^2/2 := M_{\mathsf{AB}}\mathsf{O}Q^{\mathsf{A}}\mathsf{O}Q^{\mathsf{B}}/2$. We assume for now that this takes the most physically standard form that is homogeneous quadratic in the velocities ('Jacobi-type' [8]). I lift this assumption in [4]. The action is then

$$S := \int \mathrm{d}\lambda \, L = 2\int \mathrm{d}\lambda \sqrt{TW} \ , \tag{3}$$

for 'potential factor' $W = W(\boldsymbol{Q}) := E - V(\boldsymbol{Q})$ for mechanics and $:= R - 2\Lambda$ for GR. [The latter is restricted to minisuperspace in the present Sec. See the next Sec for extension to full GR. $R = R(t)$ alone here is the Ricci 3-scalar and Λ is the cosmological constant.]

A second implementation for ii) is that the action be *manifestly parametrization irrelevant*, i.e. making no use of λ. Consequently, there is no primary notion of velocity, kinetic energy, Lagrangian, and more [4, 12]. Velocities have been supplanted at the primary level by differentials ('changes in configuration'):

$$\text{d(configuration variable) i.e. } \mathrm{d}Q^{\mathsf{A}} \ . \tag{4}$$

Then also kinetic energy has been supplanted by *kinetic arc element*

$$\mathrm{d}s := ||\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{Q}||_{\boldsymbol{M}} := \sqrt{M_{\mathsf{AB}}(\boldsymbol{Q})\mathrm{d}Q^{\mathsf{A}}\mathrm{d}Q^{\mathsf{B}}} \ , \tag{5}$$

and Lagrangians by 'Jacobian alias physical arc elements'

$$\mathrm{d}J = \mathrm{d}s\sqrt{2W(\boldsymbol{Q})} \ . \tag{6}$$

Note that the kinetic and Jacobi arc elements are related by just a conformal transformation. Thus one has

$$S := \int \mathrm{d}J \ . \tag{7}$$

I.e. viewed in terms of the physical $\mathrm{d}J$, one has a *geodesic principle*. So the problem of motion reduces to the problem of finding the geodesics associated with some geometry. (In the present Article's case a Riemannian geometry, see [4] for other examples.) On the other hand, in terms of the kinetic $\mathrm{d}s$, one has a Misner-type [9] *parageodesic principle* (i.e. geodesic modulo a conformal factor).

A third formulation of ii) follows the second formulation's steps too but is considered to be the construction of an action corresponding to a given geometry. Thus no reference is ever made to the parameter that is, in any case, irrelevant. It is a further advance for background-independent physics to not name one's entities or techniques after physically-irrelevant properties. For the present Article's case, this is *Jacobi's construction* of a mechanics from a given geometry that then plays the role of the corresponding configuration space geometry.

E.g. the minisuperspace form of this [31] for the example of relevance to this Article is the Misner-type action [9]

$$S = \tfrac{1}{2}\int \mathrm{d}s \, \sqrt{\overline{W}} \ , \quad \mathrm{d}s := \sqrt{\exp(3\Omega)\{-\mathrm{d}\Omega^2 + \mathrm{d}\phi^2\}} \ , \quad \overline{W} := \exp(3\Omega)\{\exp(-2\Omega) - V(\phi) - 2\Lambda\} \ . \tag{8}$$

Here Ω is the Misner variable, related to the usual scalefactor by $a = \exp(\Omega)$, ϕ is the scalar field, and overline is the standard notation for densitization.

At the classical level, Temporal Relationalism can be resolved along the lines of classical time being emergent at a secondary level via *Mach's Time Principle*: ' time is to be abstracted from change'.
Three distinct proposals to implement this then involve 'any change' (Rovelli [32]), 'all change' (Barbour [33]) and my *sufficient totality of locally significant change (STLRC)* [34]. As detailed in [34], all three of these proposals have some sense in which they are 'democratic' However, only the last two take into consideration that 'some clocks are better than others' is an essential part of accurate timekeeping [33]. Additionally, only the first and the third are operationally realizable.[1] Thus overall, STLRC wins out. The time abstracted from this is a *generalization* of the astronomers' *ephemeris time* that emphasizes that such a procedure is in practise *local*. Thus I term it a 'GLET', and posit the specialization of the Machian emergent time resolution to 'GLET is to be abstracted from STLRC'.
A specific implementation of a Machian emergent time is then as follows. It is a time that is distinguished by its simplification of the momentum–velocity relations and equations of motion using $\partial/\partial t^{\mathrm{em(J)}} := \sqrt{W/T}\partial/\partial\lambda = \sqrt{2W}\mathrm{d}/\mathrm{d}s$. This can be integrated up to give

$$t^{\mathrm{em(J)}} = \int \mathrm{d}\lambda\sqrt{T/W} = \int \mathrm{d}s \Big/ \sqrt{2W} \ . \tag{9}$$

In the case of mechanics, this gives a recovery of Newton's time on a temporally-relational footing. For the minisuperspace example of relevance to this paper, the emergent time takes the form

$$t^{\mathrm{em(J)}} = \int \sqrt{-\mathrm{d}\Omega^2 + \mathrm{d}\phi^2} \Big/ \sqrt{\exp(-2\Omega) - V(\phi) - 2\Lambda} \tag{10}$$

and can be interpreted as a relational recovery of cosmic time.

3 Compatibility between Configurational and Temporal Relationalism

Combining Temporal and Configurational Relationalism requires new auxiliaries. I.e. cyclic differentials in place of multiplier coordinates, with supporting free-end notion of space value variation [19, 4].[2] RPM and GR examples of doubly-relational actions are then, respectively,

$$S = \sqrt{2}\int \mathrm{d}s\sqrt{E - V(\boldsymbol{q})} \ , \quad \mathrm{d}s := ||\mathrm{d}_{\underline{A},\underline{B}}\boldsymbol{q}||_{\boldsymbol{M}} := \sqrt{M_{iIjJ}\mathrm{d}_{\underline{A},\underline{B}}q^{iI}\mathrm{d}_{\underline{A},\underline{B}}q^{jJ}} \ , \quad \mathrm{d}_{\underline{A},\underline{B}}\underline{q}^I := \underline{q}^I - \mathrm{d}\underline{A} - \mathrm{d}\underline{B} \times \underline{q}^I \ , \tag{11}$$

$$S_{\mathrm{GR}} = \int\int_{\Sigma} \partial s_{\mathrm{GR}}\sqrt{\sqrt{\mathrm{h}}\{\mathrm{R}(\underline{x};\mathbf{h}] - 2\Lambda\}} \ , \quad \partial s_{\mathrm{GR}} := ||\partial_{\underline{\mathrm{F}}}\mathbf{h}||_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}} := \sqrt{M^{ijkl}\partial_{\underline{\mathrm{F}}}\mathrm{h}_{ij}\partial_{\underline{\mathrm{F}}}\mathrm{h}_{kl}} \ , \quad \partial_{\underline{\mathrm{F}}}\mathrm{h}_{ij} := \partial\mathrm{h}_{ij} - \pounds_{\partial\underline{\mathrm{F}}}\mathrm{h}_{ij} \ . \tag{12}$$

Here also $\underline{\mathrm{F}}$ is a Diff(Σ) auxiliary ('F for frame', such that $\dot{\underline{\mathrm{F}}}$ is the usual ADM shift), and

$$\mathcal{M}^{ijkl} := \sqrt{\mathrm{h}}\{\mathrm{h}^{ik}\mathrm{h}^{jl} - \mathrm{h}^{ij}\mathrm{h}^{kl}\} \tag{13}$$

is the GR configuration space (alias inverse DeWitt) supermetric. Straight fonts denote field quantities, and (;] denotes a mix of function dependence (before the semicolon) and functional dependence (after it).

Then the RPM case of emergent Machian time [Jacobi–Barbour–Bertotti (JBB) time [14, 4]] is

$$t^{\mathrm{em(JBB)}} = \mathrm{E}_{\underline{A},\,\underline{B}\,\in\,\mathrm{Tr,\,Rot}}\left(\int ||\mathrm{d}_{\underline{A},\underline{B}}\boldsymbol{q}||_{\boldsymbol{M}} \Big/ \sqrt{2\{E - V(\boldsymbol{q})\}}\right) \tag{14}$$

and the GR case is

$$\mathrm{t}^{\mathrm{em(JBB)}}(\underline{x}) = \mathrm{E}_{\underline{\mathrm{F}}\,\in\,\mathrm{Diff}(\Sigma)}\left(\int ||\partial_{\underline{\mathrm{F}}}\mathbf{h}||_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}} / \sqrt{\mathrm{R}(\underline{x};\mathbf{h}] - 2\Lambda}\right) \ . \tag{15}$$

Here $\mathrm{E}_{g\in\mathfrak{g}}$ denotes extremization over $\mathfrak{g}$ of the corresponding relational action, subject to $\mathfrak{q}$, $\mathfrak{g}$ and that action being suitably compatible [20].

[1] For STLRC, democracy is in all change having *the opportunity* to contribute. Then only those changes whose contributions lead to effects above the desired accuracy are actually kept in practise, by which it also manages to be both operationally well-defined and a provider of accurate timekeeping. Contrast this with 'all change', for which, since some of the universe's contents are but highly inaccurately known or completely unknown, one can not include 'all change' in accurate/practical calculations.

[2] Cyclic differentials is the same useage as in the more common expression 'cyclic velocities' in the Principles of Dynamics, the difference being that the former additionally evokes no (label) time. Also 'notion of space' here means in particular 'point' for particle models and 'spatial hypersurface' for geometrodynamics and field theory.

4 Configurations for slightly inhomogeneous cosmology

Parallelling [21]'s treatment of the ADM split of GR for approximately homogeneous isotropic cosmologies, the 3-metric and scalar field are expanded as

$$\mathrm{h}_{ij}(t,\underline{x}) = \exp(2\Omega(t))\{S_{ij}(t) + \epsilon_{ij}(t,\underline{x})\} \ , \quad \phi(t,\underline{x}) = \sigma^{-1}\left\{\phi(t) + \eta(t,\underline{x})\right\} \ . \tag{16}$$

Here, S_{ij} is the standard hyperspherical $\mathbb{S}^3$ metric, and ϵ_{ij} are inhomogeneous perturbations. $\phi(t)$ is the homogeneous part of the scalar field, $\sigma := \sqrt{2/3\pi}/m_{\mathrm{Pl}}$ is a normalization factor, and η_{ij} are inhomogeneous perturbations. The perturbations can furthermore be expanded as

$$\eta(t,\underline{x}) = \sum\nolimits_{\mathrm{n,\,l,\,m}} f_{\mathrm{nlm}}\,\mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{n}}_{\mathrm{lm}}(\underline{x}) \ , \tag{17}$$

$$\epsilon_{ij} = \sum_{\mathrm{n,l,m}} \left\{\sqrt{\tfrac{2}{3}}a_{\mathrm{nlm}}S_{ij}\mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{n}}{}_{\mathrm{lm}} + \sqrt{6}b_{\mathrm{nlm}}\{\mathrm{P}_{ij}\}^{\mathrm{n}}{}_{\mathrm{lm}} + \sqrt{2}\{c^{\mathrm{o}}_{\mathrm{nlm}}\{\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{o}}_{ij}\}^{\mathrm{n}}{}_{\mathrm{lm}} + c^{\mathrm{e}}_{\mathrm{nlm}}\{\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{e}}_{ij}\}^{\mathrm{n}}{}_{\mathrm{lm}}\} + 2\{d^{\mathrm{o}}_{\mathrm{nlm}}\{\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{o}}_{ij}\}^{\mathrm{n}}{}_{\mathrm{lm}} + d^{\mathrm{e}}_{\mathrm{nlm}}\{\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{e}}_{ij}\}^{\mathrm{n}}{}_{\mathrm{lm}}\}\right\}. \tag{18}$$

Following [35, 36], $\mathrm{Q}(\underline{x})$ are the $\mathbb{S}^3$ scalar harmonics, $\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{o}}_i(\underline{x})$ and $\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{e}}_i(\underline{x})$ are the transverse $\mathbb{S}^3$ vector harmonics, and $\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{o}}_{ij}(\underline{x})$ and $\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{e}}_{ij}(\underline{x})$ are the transverse traceless $\mathbb{S}^3$ symmetric 2-tensor harmonics. The superscripts 'o' and 'e' for stand for 'odd' and 'even'. The $\mathrm{S}_{ij}(\underline{x})$ are then given by $\mathrm{S}_{ij} := \mathrm{D}_j\mathrm{S}_i + \mathrm{D}_i\mathrm{S}_j$ (for each of the o, e superscripts) and the $\mathrm{P}_{ij}(\underline{x})$ are traceless objects given by $\mathrm{P}_{ij} := \mathrm{D}_j\mathrm{D}_i\mathrm{Q}/\{\mathrm{n}^2 - 1\} + S_{ij}\mathrm{Q}/3$. An important distinction to make is between the *plain perturbation scheme* of (16) and the *modewise perturbation scheme* of (17, 18).

In the latter, additionally, the relational formulation's differential of the frame auxiliary is expanded as

$$\partial \mathrm{F}_i = \exp(\Omega)\sum\nolimits_{\mathrm{n,\,l,\,m}} \left\{\mathrm{d}k_{\mathrm{nlm}}\{\mathrm{P}_i\}^{\mathrm{n}}{}_{\mathrm{lm}}/\sqrt{6} + \sqrt{2}\{\mathrm{d}j^{\mathrm{o}}_{\mathrm{nlm}}\{\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{o}}_i\}^{\mathrm{n}}{}_{\mathrm{lm}} + \mathrm{d}j^{\mathrm{e}}_{\mathrm{nlm}}\{\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{e}}_i\}^{\mathrm{n}}{}_{\mathrm{lm}}\}\right\} \tag{19}$$

for $\mathrm{P}_i := \mathrm{D}_i\mathrm{Q}/\{\mathrm{n}^2 - 1\}$. The relational formulation differs from [21] not only in using this distinct formulation of auxiliary but also in not having a primary lapse to expand. This is because the lapse is not held to have meaningful primary existence, so it is not to be an independent source of perturbations. Consequently the relational formulation has one family of coefficients less than Halliwell–Hawking (their g_{nlm}).

Note that *multipole expansion coefficients* a_{nlm}, b_{nlm}, $c^{\mathrm{o}}_{\mathrm{nlm}}$, $c^{\mathrm{e}}_{\mathrm{nlm}}$, $d^{\mathrm{o}}_{\mathrm{nlm}}$, $d^{\mathrm{e}}_{\mathrm{nlm}}$, f_{nlm}, $\mathrm{d}j^{\mathrm{o}}_{\mathrm{nlm}}$, $\mathrm{d}j^{\mathrm{e}}_{\mathrm{nlm}}$, $\mathrm{d}k_{\mathrm{nlm}}$ are functions of the coordinate time t (which is also label time λ for GR) alone. n, l, m, o and e labels are subsequently denoted by just a multi-index 'n'. I also use x_{n} as a shorthand for the gravitational modes, c_{n} and d_{n} for each e-o pair of these, and $\mathrm{d}y_{\mathrm{n}}$ for the auxiliaries considered together. The x_{n}, f_{n} and $\mathrm{d}y_{\mathrm{n}}$ are regarded as small quantities in the subsequent analysis, in particular with third-order quantities always neglected in this Article.



Figure 2: The differences between the relational and ADM–HH formulations of perturbative slightly inhomogeneous cosmology. The differences between the upper and lower 'floors' in the diagram are in the auxiliaries used (Lagrange multipliers N, N_0, g_{n} downstairs and cyclic differentials $\partial\tau$, $\mathrm{d}\tau_0$ and $\mathrm{d}g_{\mathrm{n}}$ upstairs). HH stands for 'Halliwell–Hawking', BSW for Baierlein–Sharp–Wheeler [10], BFO for Barbour–Foster–O Murchadha and SIC for slightly inhomogeneous cosmology. The 'A split' is the cyclic differential analogue of the ADM split. The bent arrow to the top encircled action is this Article's procedure, whereas the ADM–HH action is the second circled action. The upstairs and downstairs squares are equally non-commuting, so the two circled actions are *not* quite equivalent. They differ as regards how time is treated. Nonetheless, they produce all of the same constraint equations in suitable Hamiltonian-type formulations. (For Temporal Relationalism compatibility [12], the relational approach requires a partial differential almost-Hamiltonian, i.e. an object that contains auxiliary partial derivative variables as well as configurations and momenta.) This is with the exception of the ADM–Halliwell–Hawking case containing a linear Hamiltonian constraint contribution from variation with respect to the perturbation of the lapse.

5 Outline of $\mathfrak{q}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ for slightly inhomogeneous cosmology

This arena's redundant configuration space [37] is infinite-dimensional and spanned by Ω, ϕ, x_{n} and f_{n}. Counting this out, one has a 1-scalar FLRW minisuperspace's 2 global degrees of freedom and redundant GR's 6 degrees of freedom

per value of the mode multi-index n plus the scalar's 1 degree of freedom per n. I.e. $2 + 7 \times \{\text{countable } \infty\}$ degrees of freedom. Additionally, the $\mathrm{d}y_{\mathrm{n}}$ contain the 3 (unphysical) degrees of freedom per n. Thus the total redundant count is $2 + 10 \times \{\text{countable } \infty\}$ degrees of freedom.

For a pure-GR sector, $\mathrm{Riem}(\mathbb{S}^3)$ is the $1 + 6 \times \{\text{countable } \infty\}$ dimensional space of scale variables and perturbations x_{n}. The supermetric on this is readily computible from DeWitt's formula (13) via (16) and (18); the second-order conribution to this is as per Fig 3. Call this space equipped by this metric $\mathrm{Riem}_{0,1,2}(\mathbb{S}^3)$ Moreover, Fig 3 gives the full second order perturbed configuration space metric for GR with minimally-coupled scalar field. I.e. the $2+7\times\{\text{countable } \infty\}$ dimensional space of scale variables, homogeneous scalar modes and perturbations $x_{\mathrm{n}}, f_{\mathrm{n}}$. Fig 3 can display this and the pure GR sector at once because the scalar field is minimally coupled. Thus by the direct sum split for GR plus minimally-coupled matter ('mcm')

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{grav}} \oplus \mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{mcm}} \ , \tag{20}$$

the slightly inhomogeneous cosmology configuration space is $\mathfrak{q}_{0,1,2} = \mathrm{Riem}_{0,1,2}(\mathbb{S}^3) \oplus \mathrm{S}_{0,1,2}(\mathbb{S}^3)$ applies, for S the scalar field configuration space. Moreover, metric variables enter the scalar field sector but scalar field variables do not enter the gravitational sector.

$M_{\mathsf{AB}} =$ $\exp(3\Omega)/2$



Figure 3: Slightly inhomogeneous cosmology's configuration space metric. The heavy dot denotes 'same as the transposed element' since metrics are symmetric. Note the matter–gravitation direct sum structure. Note also the further 'anchor-shaped' sparseness in the gravitational block, whose significance is that the gravitational modes only couple to this order to the homogeneous scale rather than also amongst themselves.

Note that there is no spatial dependence once one enters the modewise approach. See [37] for a geometrical study of the full and pure GR sector configuration space metrics for slightly inhomogeneous cosmology.

$\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{S}^3)$ start to have effect at first order; I denote the corresponding space of y_{n}'s by $\mathrm{Diff}_1(\mathbb{S}^3)$.

6 Relational action for slightly inhomogeneous cosmology

At the modewise level, the relational action for this is

$$S_{\mathrm{relational}} = \sqrt{2} \int \mathrm{d}s_{0,1,2} \sqrt{\overline{W}_{0,2}} \ . \tag{21}$$

Here $\mathrm{d}s_{0,1,2}{}^2 = \sum_{\mathrm{n}} [\mathrm{d}_{\underline{\mathrm{F}}} f_{\mathrm{n}}, \mathrm{d}\phi, \mathrm{d}\Omega, \mathrm{d}_{\underline{\mathrm{F}}} x_{\mathrm{n}}][\mathcal{M}_{\Phi} \oplus \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{grav}}][\mathrm{d}_{\underline{\mathrm{F}}} f_{\mathrm{n}}, \mathrm{d}\phi, \mathrm{d}\Omega, \mathrm{d}_{\underline{\mathrm{F}}} x_{\mathrm{n}}]^{\mathrm{tr}}$ This turns out to be the sum of '0' and '2' parts (below). The non-auxiliary portion of the '2' part can be read off Fig 3, whereas the auxiliary terms match [21]'s Lagrangian's under the correspondence $j_{\mathrm{n}}/N_0 \to \mathrm{d}j_{\mathrm{n}}$, $k_{\mathrm{n}}/N_0 \to \mathrm{d}k_{\mathrm{n}}$. In full,

$$\mathrm{d}s_0{}^2 := \exp(3\Omega)\{-\mathrm{d}\Omega^2 + \mathrm{d}\phi^2\} \ , \tag{22}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}s_2^{\mathrm{n}\,2} = {} & \frac{\exp(3\Omega)}{2} \left\{ -\mathrm{d}a_{\mathrm{n}}^2 + \frac{\mathrm{n}^2-4}{\mathrm{n}^2-1}\mathrm{d}b_{\mathrm{n}}^2 + \{\mathrm{n}^2-4\}\mathrm{d}c_{\mathrm{n}}^2 + \mathrm{d}d_{\mathrm{n}}^2 + \mathrm{d}f_{\mathrm{n}}^2 + 6a_{\mathrm{n}}\mathrm{d}f_{\mathrm{n}}\mathrm{d}\phi + \frac{2}{3}\mathrm{d}A_{\mathrm{n}}\mathrm{d}\Omega + A_{\mathrm{n}}\{\mathrm{d}\Omega^2 - \mathrm{d}\phi^2\} \right\} \\ & -\exp(2\Omega) \left\{ \{\mathrm{n}^2-4\}\mathrm{d}c_{\mathrm{n}}\mathrm{d}j_{\mathrm{n}} + \left\{ \mathrm{d}a_{\mathrm{n}} + \frac{\mathrm{n}^2-4}{\mathrm{n}^2-1}\mathrm{d}b_{\mathrm{n}} + 3f_{\mathrm{n}}\mathrm{d}\phi \right\} \frac{\mathrm{d}k_{\mathrm{n}}}{3} \right\} + \frac{\exp(\Omega)}{2} \left\{ \{\mathrm{n}^2-4\}\mathrm{d}j_{\mathrm{n}}^2 - \frac{\mathrm{d}k_{\mathrm{n}}^2}{3\{\mathrm{n}^2-1\}} \right\} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

This is expressed in terms of the useful combination

$$A_{\mathrm{n}} := -\frac{3}{2} \left\{ a_{\mathrm{n}}^2 - 4 \left\{ \frac{\mathrm{n}^2-4}{\mathrm{n}^2-1} b_{\mathrm{n}}^2 + \{\mathrm{n}^2-4\} c_{\mathrm{n}}^2 + d_{\mathrm{n}}^2 \right\} \right\} \ . \tag{24}$$

This is a gravitational sector configuration space volume correction term (from expanding the determinant, see [37]) and it is the sole coupling to the FLRW minisuperspace degrees of freedom Ω and ϕ. N.B. it is not here being used as a coordinate.

One can then decompose (23) into S, V, T pieces and/or into zeroth-, first- and second-order pieces. These pieces are readily visible in the quadratic form due to being labelled by $a_{\rm n}, b_{\rm n}, f_{\rm n}$ factors, $c_{\rm n}$ factors and $d_{\rm n}$ factors on the one hand, and by how many powers of $\mathrm{d}x_{\rm n}$, $\mathrm{d}y_{\rm n}$ each term contains.

Also the densitized $\overline{W}_{0,2} = \overline{W}_0 + \sum_{\rm n} \overline{W}_2^{\rm n}$ for $\overline{W}_0$ given by

$$\overline{W}_0 := \exp(3\Omega)\{\exp(\Omega) - V(\phi) - 2\Lambda\} \ . \tag{25}$$

and

$$\overline{W}_2^{\rm n} = \frac{\exp(\Omega)}{2}\left\{\frac{1}{3}\left\{{\rm n}^2 - \frac{5}{2}\right\}a_{\rm n}^2 + \frac{\{{\rm n}^2-7\}}{3}\frac{\{{\rm n}^2-4\}}{{\rm n}^2-1}b_{\rm n}^2 + \frac{2}{3}\{{\rm n}^2-4\}a_{\rm n}b_{\rm n} - 2\{{\rm n}^2-4\}c_{\rm n}^2 - \{{\rm n}^2+1\}d_{\rm n}^2\right\}$$
$$+\frac{\exp(3\Omega)}{2}\left\{-m^2\{f_{\rm n}^2 + 6a_{\rm n}f_{\rm n}\phi\} - \exp(-2\Omega)\{{\rm n}^2-1\}f_{\rm n}^2 - \{m^2\phi^2 + 2\Lambda\}A_{\rm n}\right\} \ . \tag{26}$$

[The first line is the nth mode's second-order contribution to the densitized Ricci scalar $\bar{R}_2^{\rm n}$, whereas the second line comprises the matter potential and cosmological constant contributions.]

Out of usefulness of this in subsequent cosmological modelling, relative to [21] itself, I have i) added a cosmological constant term. ii) This paper's model and PoT workings also immediately extend to the case with p minimally-coupled scalar fields.

7 Constraints for relational slightly inhomogeneous cosmology

At the modewise level, the classical Hamiltonian constraint gives

$$\mathcal{H} := \tfrac{\exp(-3\Omega)}{2}\big\{ -\pi_\Omega^2 + \pi_\phi^2 + \exp(6\Omega)\{V(\phi) + 2\Lambda - \exp(-2\Omega)\big\} = 0 \ . \tag{27}$$

at zeroth order, and, at second order,

$$\mathcal{H}_2 = \sum\nolimits_{\rm n}\left\{ {}^{\rm S}\mathcal{H}_2^{\rm n} + {}^{\rm V}\mathcal{H}_2^{\rm n} + {}^{\rm T}\mathcal{H}_2^{\rm n}\right\} \quad \text{for} \tag{28}$$

$${}^{\rm S}\mathcal{H}_2^{\rm n} = \tfrac{\exp(-3\Omega)}{2}\left\{\left\{\tfrac{1}{2}a_{\rm n}^2 + 10\tfrac{{\rm n}^2-4}{{\rm n}^2-1}b_{\rm n}^2\right\}\pi_\Omega^2 + \left\{\tfrac{15}{2}a_{\rm n}^2 + 6\tfrac{{\rm n}^2-4}{{\rm n}^2-1}b_{\rm n}^2\right\}\pi_\phi^2 - \pi_{a_{\rm n}}^2 + \tfrac{{\rm n}^2-1}{{\rm n}^2-4}\pi_{b_{\rm n}}^2 + \pi_{f_{\rm n}}^2 + 2a_{\rm n}\pi_{a_{\rm n}}\pi_\Omega + 8b_{\rm n}\pi_{b_{\rm n}}\pi_\Omega - 6a_{\rm n}\pi_{f_{\rm n}}\pi_\phi\right\}$$
$$-\tfrac{\exp(\Omega)}{2}\left\{\tfrac{1}{3}\left\{{\rm n}^2 - \tfrac{5}{2}\right\}a_{\rm n}^2 + \tfrac{\{{\rm n}^2-7\}}{3}\tfrac{\{{\rm n}^2-4\}}{{\rm n}^2-1}b_{\rm n}^2 + \tfrac{2}{3}\{{\rm n}^2-4\}a_{\rm n}b_{\rm n} - \{{\rm n}^2-1\}f_{\rm n}^2\right\}$$
$$+\tfrac{\exp(3\Omega)}{2}\left\{m^2\{f_{\rm n}^2 + 6a_{\rm n}f_{\rm n}\phi\} + \{m^2\phi^2 + 2\Lambda\}\left\{\tfrac{3}{2}a_{\rm n}^2 - 6\tfrac{{\rm n}^2-4}{{\rm n}^2-1}b_{\rm n}^2\right\}\right\} \ , \tag{29}$$

$${}^{\rm V}\mathcal{H}_2^{\rm n} = \tfrac{\exp(-3\Omega)}{2}\left\{\{{\rm n}^2-4\}c_{\rm n}^2\{10\pi_\Omega^2 + 6\pi_\phi^2\} + \tfrac{\pi_{c_{\rm n}}^2}{{\rm n}^2-4} + 8c_{\rm n}\pi_{c_{\rm n}}\pi_\Omega\right\} + \{{\rm n}^2-4\}c_{\rm n}^2\{\exp(\Omega) - 3\exp(3\Omega)\{m^2\phi^2 + 2\Lambda\}\} \ , \tag{30}$$

$${}^{\rm T}\mathcal{H}_2^{\rm n} = \tfrac{\exp(-3\Omega)}{2}\left\{d_{\rm n}^2\{10\pi_\Omega^2 + 6\pi_\phi^2\} + \pi_{d_{\rm n}}^2 + 8d_{\rm n}\pi_{d_{\rm n}}\pi_\Omega\right\} + d_{\rm n}^2\left\{\tfrac{{\rm n}^2+1}{2}\exp(\Omega) - 3\exp(3\Omega)\{m^2\phi^2 + 2\Lambda\}\right\} \ . \tag{31}$$

Also $\mathcal{M}_{1i} = [{}^{\rm S}\mathcal{M}_1^{\rm n},\ {}^{\rm V}\mathcal{M}_1^{\rm n}]$ is the vector corresponding to the $[\mathrm{d}k_{\rm n}, \mathrm{d}j_{\rm n}^{\rm o}, \mathrm{d}j_{\rm n}^{\rm e}]$ of auxiliaries. The momentum constraint vanishes at zeroth order, and has S and V parts to first order:

$${}^{\rm S}\mathcal{M}_1^{\rm n} = \tfrac{\exp(-3\Omega)}{3}\left\{-\pi_{a_{\rm n}} + \pi_{b_{\rm n}} + \left\{a_{\rm n} + 4\tfrac{{\rm n}^2-4}{{\rm n}^2-1}b_{\rm n}\right\}\pi_\Omega + 3f_{\rm n}\pi_\phi\right\} \ , \tag{32}$$

$${}^{\rm V}\mathcal{M}_1^{\rm n} = \exp(-\Omega)\{\pi_{c_{\rm n}} + 4\{{\rm n}^2-4\}c_{\rm n}\pi_\Omega\} \ . \tag{33}$$

Note 1) in Hamiltonian variables, the second-order Hamiltonian constraint pieces and the first-order momentum constraint pieces coincide for the relational and ADM–Halliwell–Hawking approaches.
Note 2) As a count toward whether the system is well-determined, for now we have 10 degrees of freedom per mode value n and 6 constraints imposed per n. One needs a Principles of Dynamics treatment (Sec 10) to get further details and be satisfied with the count. I.e. this is down to the particular phase space geometry rather than just mere counting.
Note 3) On the other hand, a plain perturbation treatment produces $\underline{x}$-dependent constraints.

8 Machian classical emergent time for slightly inhomogeneous cosmology

In the modewise approximation, the emergent JBB time is now (E involves all n rather than just a particular n)

$$t^{\rm em(JBB)} = \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{d}k_{\rm n}, \mathrm{d}j_{\rm n} \in \mathrm{Diff}_1(\mathbb{S}^3)}\left(\int \sqrt{\mathrm{d}{s_0}^2 + \sum\nolimits_{\rm n} \mathrm{d}_{j_{\rm n},k_{\rm n}}{s_{\rm n}}^2} \Big/ \sqrt{2\left\{W_0 + \sum\nolimits_{\rm n} W_{\rm n}\right\}}\right) \ . \tag{34}$$

9 Slightly inhomogeneous cosmology's thin sandwich

Best Matching is the $Q^{\mathsf{A}}, \mathrm{d}Q^{\mathsf{A}}$ variables level solution of the constraints that are linear in the momenta. This generalizes the Thin Sandwich Problem to a wider variety of linear first-class constraints. Using t^{em} to resolve the PoT specifically further motivates study of the thin sandwich formulation. The slightly inhomogeneous cosmology case of this pushes one into a situation in which the reduction involves second-class constraints. Here naïve elimination does not suffice. One needs a further procedure. Gauge-fixing, second class constraint removing or geometrical isolation of coordinates that are beables are candidates for such procedures. See [37] for what happens down each of these routes, with a study of the geometries of Riem, Superspace and spaces intermediate between these that occur in some of these routes.
All the momentum constraint components (32, 33) are manifestly algebraic, and, being linear, manifestly solvable. To address the Thin Sandwich, they need to be recast in the Jacobi formulation. By slightly inhomogenous cosmology's momentum–change relations, (32, 33) become the slightly inhomogeneous cosmology thin sandwich equations

$$\mathrm{d}a_{\mathrm{n}} + \frac{\mathrm{n}^2-4}{\mathrm{n}^2-1}\mathrm{d}b_{\mathrm{n}} + \exp(-\Omega)\frac{\mathrm{d}k_{\mathrm{n}}}{\mathrm{n}^2-1} + 3f_{\mathrm{n}}\mathrm{d}\phi = 0 \ , \tag{35}$$

$$\mathrm{d}c_{\mathrm{n}} - \exp(-\Omega)\mathrm{d}j_{\mathrm{n}} = 0 \ . \tag{36}$$

They are to be interpreted as to be solved for the first-order auxiliary variables $\mathrm{d}j_{\mathrm{n}}$ and $\mathrm{d}k_{\mathrm{n}}$. The actual solving is in this case immediate. Just note that the above two equations are i) decoupled. ii) They are individually well-determined. [There are even and odd $\mathrm{d}j_{\mathrm{n}}$ but also even and odd $\mathrm{d}c_{\mathrm{n}}$, whilst everything in the equation for the single $\mathrm{d}k_{\mathrm{n}}$ comes in a single copy.] iii) They are algebraically trivial as regards making whichever object therein the subject. The solutions are

$$\mathrm{d}k_{\mathrm{n}} = -\exp(\Omega)\big\{\{\mathrm{d}a_{\mathrm{n}} + 3f_{\mathrm{n}}\mathrm{d}\phi\}\{\mathrm{n}^2-1\} + \{\mathrm{n}^2-4\}\mathrm{d}b_{\mathrm{n}}\big\} \ , \tag{37}$$

$$\mathrm{d}j_{\mathrm{n}} = \exp(\Omega)\mathrm{d}c_{\mathrm{n}} \ . \tag{38}$$

The bulk of the Thin Sandwich/Best Matching approach's work is, however, in next 1) substituting this back into the action to obtain a reduced action. 2) Obtaining an explicit expression for the emergent time. Via the $\mathrm{d}c_{\mathrm{n}}$ and $\mathrm{d}j_{\mathrm{n}}$ terms forming a square that cancels out by the constraint and the elimination of the $\mathrm{d}k_{\mathrm{n}}$ producing another square in $\mathrm{d}a_{\mathrm{n}} + \mathrm{d}b_{\mathrm{n}}$ that is incorporated via the new 'sum of scalars' coordinate

$$s_{\mathrm{n}} := \sqrt{\{\mathrm{n}^2-4\}/3}\{a_{\mathrm{n}} + b_{\mathrm{n}}\} \ , \tag{39}$$

the reduced configuration space's line element is [for A_{n} now a coordinate]

$$\mathrm{d}{s_{\mathrm{bm}}^{\mathrm{n}}}^2 = \tfrac{\exp(3\Omega)}{2}\Big\{\mathrm{d}s_{\mathrm{n}}^2 + \mathrm{d}f_{\mathrm{n}}^2 + \mathrm{d}d_{\mathrm{n}}^2 + \Big\{\Big\{3\mathrm{d}a_{\mathrm{n}} + \sqrt{3\{\mathrm{n}^2-4\}}\mathrm{d}s_{\mathrm{n}}\Big\}f_{\mathrm{n}} + 6a_{\mathrm{n}}\mathrm{d}f_{\mathrm{n}}\Big\}\mathrm{d}\phi + \tfrac{2}{3}\mathrm{d}A_{\mathrm{n}}\mathrm{d}\Omega - A_{\mathrm{n}}\{-\mathrm{d}\Omega^2 + \mathrm{d}\phi^2\}\Big\} \ . \tag{40}$$

Note that this is not superspace. This occurrence is tied to ${}^{\mathrm{S}}\mathcal{M}$, ${}^{\mathrm{V}}\mathcal{M}$ being revealed to be second-class below. The block by block degrees of freedom count is $12 - 2 - 1 \times 2 = 8$. The full configuration space degrees of freedom count is $2 + 10\,\mathrm{N} - \{2 + 1 \times 2\}\mathrm{N} = 2 + 6\mathrm{N}$. The reduced configuration spaces are studied further in [37]. It is found that these have a Ricci scalar singularity for the physically innocuous case of zero scalar field perturbation. This is rendered somewhat less surprising by the mechanical analogy of configuration space Ricci curvature singularities for collinear configurations in 3-*d*.

10 Constraint closure for slightly inhomogenous cosmology

Functional Evolution Problem (Isham and Kuchař's [1] name for field theory QM case). Whether the Hamiltonian and momentum constraints are all that one needs at the quantum level by virtue of constraints closing and of anomalies not arising. Constraint Closure Problem is, however, a more widely applicable name (to finite models and at the classical level).

In the case of full GR at the classical level, this is resolved by the Dirac algebroid of constraints

$$\mathbf{\{}(\mathcal{M}_i|\partial\mathrm{L}^i)\mathbf{,}\,(\mathcal{M}_j|\partial\mathrm{M}^j)\mathbf{\}} = (\mathcal{M}_i|\,[\partial\mathrm{L},\partial\mathrm{M}]^i) \ , \tag{41}$$

$$\mathbf{\{}(\mathcal{H}|\partial\mathrm{J})\mathbf{,}\,(\mathcal{M}_i|\partial\mathrm{L}^i)\mathbf{\}} = (\pounds_{\partial\underline{\mathrm{L}}}\mathcal{H}|\partial\mathrm{J}) \ , \tag{42}$$

$$\mathbf{\{}(\mathcal{H}|\partial\mathrm{J})\mathbf{,}\,(\mathcal{H}|\partial\mathrm{K})\mathbf{\}} = (\mathcal{M}_i h^{ij}|\partial\mathrm{J}\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial}_j\partial\mathrm{K}) \ . \tag{43}$$

Note that this is a smeared formulation ($\partial\mathrm{J}$, $\partial\mathrm{K}$ are smearing functions for $\mathcal{H}$ and $\partial\mathrm{L}^i$, $\partial\mathrm{M}^i$ are smearing functions for $\mathcal{M}_i$; using such differentials is adopting a Temporal Relationalism compatible form for the smearing [12]). I also use the QFT-type notation $X\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial}{}^iY := \{\partial^iY\}X - Y\partial^iX$.

In the case of plain perturbation theory, the second order (2-subscript) smeared constraint brackets are

$$\{(\mathcal{M}_i|\partial \mathrm{L}^i),(\mathcal{M}_j|\partial \mathrm{M}^j)\}_2 = (\mathcal{M}_{i1}|\,[\partial \mathrm{L}_1,\mathrm{dM}_0]^i + [\mathrm{dL}_0,\partial \mathrm{M}_1]^i)\ , \tag{44}$$

$$\{(\mathcal{H}|\partial \mathrm{J}),(\mathcal{M}_i|\partial \mathrm{L}^i)\}_2 = (\pounds_{\partial \underline{\mathrm{L}}_1}\mathcal{H}_1|\mathrm{dJ}_0)\ , \tag{45}$$

$$\{(\mathcal{H}|\mathrm{dJ}),(\mathcal{H}|\mathrm{dK})\}_2 = (\mathcal{M}_i|S^{ij}\{\mathrm{dK}_0\partial_j\,\partial \mathrm{J}_1 - \mathrm{dJ}_0\partial_j\,\partial \mathrm{K}_1\})\ . \tag{46}$$

The slightly inhomogeneous cosmology case's constraints, however, need no smearing because they are finite block by block. S, V, T cross-brackets are zero [with $\{{}^{\mathrm{S}}\mathcal{M},{}^{\mathrm{V}}\mathcal{M}\}$ including a second-order term]. Likewise brackets between blocks of different n are zero. I.e. the S–V–T and n-wise splits are preserved under the brackets operation. Each block being finite, self-brackets are all zero. In particular, the bracket of two Hamiltonian constraints simplifies to give zero right-hand side. This leaves two nonzero brackets, from the S and V sectors each possessing two constraints. $\{{}^{\mathrm{S}}\mathcal{H},{}^{\mathrm{S}}\mathcal{M}\}$ and $\{{}^{\mathrm{V}}\mathcal{H},{}^{\mathrm{V}}\mathcal{M}\}$ are nonzero in a manner that implies that ${}^{\mathrm{S}}\mathcal{M}$ and ${}^{\mathrm{S}}\mathcal{H}$ are second class with respect to each other, and ${}^{\mathrm{V}}\mathcal{M}$ and ${}^{\mathrm{V}}\mathcal{H}$ are second class with respect to each other.
Introducing the further reductive and blockwise-minimally useful modewise variables

$$\Omega_{\mathrm{n}} := \Omega - A_{\mathrm{n}}/3\ , \tag{47}$$

$$\phi_{\mathrm{n}} := \phi - 3b_{\mathrm{n}}f_{\mathrm{n}}/2\ . \tag{48}$$

the configuration space degree of freedom count issue is resolved according to the following table.

Type	Names	Number and removals	New names	More removals	Final count
0th order	Ω,ϕ	2	$\Omega_{\mathrm{n}},\phi_{\mathrm{n}}$		
S:	$a_{\mathrm{n}},b_{\mathrm{n}},f_{\mathrm{n}}$	3 – 1 for ${}^{\mathrm{S}}\mathcal{M}$ 2nd-class	$s_{\mathrm{n}},f_{\mathrm{n}}$	– 1 for ${}^{\mathrm{S}}\mathcal{H}$ 2nd-class	1 scalar mode
V:	c_{n}	2 – 1 for ${}^{\mathrm{V}}\mathcal{M}$ 2nd-class	lose 2 c_{n}, gain 1 A_{n}	– 1 for ${}^{\mathrm{V}}\mathcal{H}$ 2nd-class	0 vector modes
T:	d_{n}	2		– 2 for ${}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathcal{H}$ 1st-class	2 tensor modes
Total:		9 – 2		– 4	= 3 as expected.

Note 1) A_{n} is of mixed SVTness (despite appearing in the V-mode column in the count). In any case, this quantity is ultimately unphysical.
Note 2) Moreover, these constraints brackets and associated degrees of freedom count resolution reveal that [21] is using rather questionable assumptions in its quantization.

11 Details of beables for slightly inhomogeneous cosmology

The *Problem of Beables* concerns finding quantities that commute with all the constraints (or maybe just the linear ones).

Let us start with the pure gravity case. In $\mathrm{Riem}_{0,1,2}(\mathbb{S}^3)$ among the Halliwell–Hawking coordinates themselves, in the modewise case one finds the Kuchař beables $d^{\mathrm{o}}_{\mathrm{n}}$, $d^{\mathrm{e}}_{\mathrm{n}}$, and one more as the blockwise simplifier coordinate (47). At the level of Superspace, the scalar sum (with a different constant of proportionality)

$$s'_{\mathrm{n}} := \tfrac{1-\mathrm{n}^2}{3\mathrm{n}^2}\{a_{\mathrm{n}}+b_{\mathrm{n}}\} \tag{49}$$

is a natural coordinate and this is also a Kuchař beable. We then note that the momenta associated with these that are also beables are no longer all conjugate momenta. I.e. the two $\pi_{d_{\mathrm{n}}}$,

$$\pi_{2sn} := \tfrac{1}{4}\tfrac{\mathrm{n}^2-1}{\mathrm{n}^2-4}\pi_{b_{\mathrm{n}}} - \pi_{a_{\mathrm{n}}} \tag{50}$$

and π_Ω (specifically a weak Kuchař beable). Then functionals of these 'basis beables' are also classical Kuchař beables. The algebra that the basis beables form involves 4 pairs giving brackets of 1 as per the 4-d Heisenberg algebra and the single additional interlinking relation,

$$\{\Omega_{\mathrm{n}},\pi_{2s_2}\} = s_{\mathrm{n}}\ . \tag{51}$$

For the case with a minimally coupled scalar field, f_{n} and

$$\phi'_{\mathrm{n}} := \phi - 3b_{\mathrm{n}}f_{\mathrm{n}} \tag{52}$$

are to be added to this. The momenta associated with these are then $\pi_{f_{\mathrm{n}}}$ and the scalar dilational momentum

$$\pi_{2\phi} := \phi\pi_\phi + f_{\mathrm{n}}\pi_{f_{\mathrm{n}}}\ . \tag{53}$$

The further brackets are firstly Heisenberg's 1 for f_n and its conjugate, secondly

$$\{\phi_{\mathrm{n}},\pi_{2\phi}\} = \phi_{\mathrm{n}}\ , \tag{54}$$

and finally the interlinking relations

$$\{f_{\mathrm{n}},\pi_{2\phi}\} = f_{\mathrm{n}}\ ,\quad \{\pi_{2\phi},\pi_{f_{\mathrm{n}}}\} = \pi_{\mathrm{n}}\ ,\quad \{\phi_{\mathrm{n}},\pi_{2\mathrm{n}}\} = -\tfrac{3}{4}\tfrac{\mathrm{n}^2-1}{\mathrm{n}^2-4}f_{\mathrm{n}}\ . \tag{55}$$

12 Spacetime Relationalism

For full GR, the physically irrelevant spacetime transformations are Diff($\mathfrak{M}$). Like Diff(Σ) but contrarily to the Dirac algebroid, these *do* form a Lie algebra:[3]

$$|\![(\mathrm{D}_\mu|X^\mu),(\mathrm{D}_\nu|Y^\nu)]\!| = (\mathrm{D}_\gamma|\,[X,Y]^\gamma)\ . \tag{56}$$

There is still an issue as to what role D_μ plays here; this classical realization of a Lie bracket is *not* conventionally taken to be a Poisson bracket. Moreover, unlike with Sec 1's Diff(Σ) auxiliaries, these D_μ are not conventionally associated with dynamical constraints. Nor is the above classical realization of a Lie bracket conventionally taken to be a Poisson bracket. Because of that, there is conventionally no complete spacetime analogue of the previous Sec's notion of beables/observables.

It is then well known that GR perturbation theory can be cast as an unphysical but technically-useful 5-d stack of spacetime 4-geometries that are interrelated via a point identification map encoded by the Lie derivative with respect to, now, a *spacetime 4-vector* .

13 Refoliation Invariance



Figure 4: a) The Foliation Dependence Problem is whether evolution via the dashed spatial hypersurface and via the dotted one give the same physical answers. b) Teitelboim's [28] classical 'Refoliation Invariance' resolution of this via the pictorial form of the Dirac algebroid's bracket (43). For minisuperspace [31] and mode by mode slightly inhomogeneous cosmology, this works out trivially. Although c) and e) over-represent this from a purely minisuperspace perspective compared to d) and f) [for which without loss of generality $\mathrm{d}L^i = \mathrm{id}$ due to all points being physically identical], c) and e) are needed for comparison with subsequent inhomogeneous perturbations. I.e. g) as the slightly bumpy version of e) and h) as some indication of c) in the presence of small deformations. In fact the Hamiltonian constraint's action and the evolution are typically between two distinct small deformations of $\mathbb{S}^3$, as indicated in i). The reader can then easily imagine the 'going via a dotted or dashed choice of a third spatial hypersurface(extension of this progression that nontrivially manifests slightly inhomogeneous cosmology's Foliation Dependence Problem and its classical Refoliation Invariance resolution.

14 Spacetime Reconstruction

Spacetime Reconstruction Problem This is assuming the staring point of from space and/or from a discrete ontology.

The Spacetime Reconstruction Problem receives substantial further motivation at the quantum level. Quantum Theory implies fluctuations of configuration are unavoidable. But for GR these amounts to fluctuations of 3-geometry, and these are too numerous and varied to all be embeddable within a single spacetime.

[3]Here $|\![\ ,\ ]\!|$ is the generic Lie bracket, Greek letters are spacetime indices and X^μ, Y^μ are smearing functions.

Additionally , as Wheeler [6, 38] argued, the uncertainty principle applies. Precisely-known position $\underline{q}$ and momentum $\underline{p}$ for a particle are a classical concept corresponding to a worldline. This perspective breaks down in quantum physics due to the uncertainly principle. Worldlines are replaced by more diffuse wavepackets. In the case of GR, quantum-level promotions of h_{ij} and p^{ij} are linked by an uncertainty relation. But p^{ij} is just a densitized, raised-indices trace-displaced version of the extrinsic curvature K_{ij}. Thus this amounts to h_{ij} and K_{ij} not being precisely knowable. But these are the first and second fundamental forms and thus constitute embedding data, so this amounts to QM compromising the construction of an embedding into spacetime. Thus (something like) the geometrodynamical picture (considering the set of possible 3-geometries and the dynamics of these) would be expected to take over from the spacetime picture at the quantum level.

For now at the classical level, there is the following 'spacetime from space' result for full GR [11, 12]. Let ψ^A denote fundamental-field second-order minimally-coupled bosonic matter, with conjugate momenta Π^{ψ}_A. Then
$\partial \mathrm{s}^{\mathrm{grav}-\psi} = \sqrt{\partial \mathrm{s}^{\mathrm{grav}\,2}_{y,w} + \sum_{\psi} y_{\psi}^{-1} \partial \mathrm{s}^2_{\psi}}$ (minimal coupling gives no metric–matter kinetic cross-terms so it decomposes in this blockwise manner). Here $\partial \mathrm{s}^2_{\psi} := M_{AB} \partial \psi^A \partial \psi^B$ for matter configuration space metric M_{AB} that we take to be ultralocal in the metric and with no dependence on the matter fields themselves. Also $\mathrm{W}^{\mathrm{grav}-\psi} := a\,\mathrm{R} + b + \sum_{\psi} a_{\psi} \mathrm{U}_{\psi}$ for U_{ψ} minus the matter sector's potential. This can only depend on the spatial derivatives of the spatial metric through the spatial Christoffel symbols. It is logical to give the expressions for the conjugate momenta here, rather than just symbol-defining them below Then

$$\mathcal{H}_{x,y,y_{\psi},a,a_{\psi},b} := \{y\{\mathrm{h}^{ik}\mathrm{h}^{jl} - x\mathrm{h}^{ij}\mathrm{h}^{kl}/2\}\pi_{ij}\pi_{kl} + \sum\nolimits_{\psi} y_{\psi} M^{AB}\Pi_A\Pi_B\}/\sqrt{\mathrm{h}} - \sqrt{\mathrm{h}}\left\{a\,\mathrm{R} + b + \sum\nolimits_{\psi} a_{\psi}\mathrm{U}_{\psi}\right\} = 0\ . \tag{57}$$

Here π^{ij} is the momentum conjugate to h_{ij}, with trace π. For these models, changes in all the matter degrees of freedom do have the opportunity to contribute to the emergent time standard, $t^{\mathrm{em(JBB)}} = \int \partial s^{\mathrm{grav}-\psi}/\sqrt{2\mathrm{W}^{\mathrm{grav}-\psi}}$. Then [12]

$$\mathbf{\{}(\mathcal{H}_{x,y,y_{\psi},a,a_{\psi},b}|\partial \mathrm{J}),(\mathcal{H}_{x,y,y_{\psi},a,a_{\psi},b}|\partial \mathrm{K})\mathbf{\}} = \left(ay\{\mathcal{M}_i^{\mathrm{grav}-\psi} + 2\{1-x\}\mathrm{D}_i\pi\} + \sum_{\psi}\left\{\underline{ay\left|\Pi^{\mathsf{A}}\frac{\delta \mathcal{L}_{\partial \underline{\mathrm{L}}}\psi_{\mathsf{A}}}{\delta \partial \mathrm{L}^i}\right|}\right.\right.$$

$$\left.\left. -2a_{\psi}y_{\psi}\underline{M^{AB}\Pi_A\frac{\partial \mathrm{U}_{\psi}}{\partial\,\partial_i\psi^B}}\right\} - \underline{2y\left\{\mathrm{p}_{jk} - \frac{x}{2}\mathrm{p}\mathrm{h}_{jk}\right\}\mathrm{h}_{il}\sum_{\psi} a_{\psi}\left\{\frac{\partial \mathrm{U}_{\psi}}{\partial \Gamma^c{}_{jl}}\mathrm{h}^{ck} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial \mathrm{U}_{\psi}}{\partial \Gamma^c{}_{jk}}\mathrm{h}^{lc}\right\}}\right| \partial \mathrm{J}\overleftrightarrow{\partial}^i\partial \mathrm{K}\right)\ . \tag{58}$$

Also the 'floor bracket' denotes the extent to which the variational derivative inside acts. The intent being to cover minimally-coupled scalars, electromagnetism etc, all of these have no Christoffel symbol terms in their potentials, by which the last underlined grouping drops out. The pure-gravitation parts of these results follow from the second term [11, 12]. The local relativity of matter parts of these results ([12] and references thereinb) follow as means of the other two underlined terms cancelling each other.
This result can be interpreted as limiting one's options – via a Dirac-type procedure [26, 12] – for what type of theory emerges. The inverse DeWitt supermetric value $x = 1$ drops out alongside the locally Lorentzian physics of SR as one option. The y's furnish another option – a geometrostatics that is in a sense a Riemannian space generalization of locally Galilean relativity. The a's furnish a third option, leading to the strong-coupled limit of GR alongside Carrolian relativity (each point can only communicate with itself). Finally $\pi/\sqrt{h} = constant$ arises as a fourth option, not furtherly pursued here. The first option furthermore leads to a recovery of the GR-type notion of spacetime. In essence, the constraint equations admit interpretation as embedding equations into a manifold of dimension one larger.
In minisuperspace and modewise slightly inhomogeneous cosmology, this result becomes trivial, due to D_i having nothing to act upon. Also in this case, this working does not fix the a priori free coefficient in the supermetric.
However for plain perturbation slightly inhomogeneous cosmology, the result survives in nontrivial form. Here the bracket of $\mathcal{H}_{a,b,x,y}$ with itself gives

$$\mathbf{\{}(\mathcal{H}_{x,y,y_{\phi},a,a_{\phi},b}|\partial \mathrm{J}),(\mathcal{H}_{x,y,y_{\phi},a,a_{\phi},b}|\partial \mathrm{K})\mathbf{\}}_2 = \left(ay\{\mathcal{M}_{1i}^{\mathrm{grav}-\Phi} + 2\{1-x\}\exp(-2\Omega)\mathrm{D}_i\pi_1\} + ay\left|\pi_1^{\Phi}\frac{\delta \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{d}\underline{\mathrm{L}}}\phi_0}{\delta \mathrm{d}\mathrm{L}^i}\right|\right.$$

$$\left. -2a_{\Phi}y_{\Phi}\exp(-3\Omega)\pi_0^{\Phi}\frac{\partial \mathrm{U}_{1\,\Phi}}{\partial\,\partial_i\Phi}\right\}\Big| S^{ij}\{\partial \mathrm{K}_0\partial_j\,\partial \mathrm{J}_1 - \partial \mathrm{J}_0\partial_j\,\partial \mathrm{K}_1\}\Big) \tag{59}$$

so classical spacetime reconstruction from space is fully functional for slightly inhomogeneous cosmology. Indeed, all four of the above-mentioned options are represented.

15 Conclusion

This Article concerned a local resolution of the Problem of Time (PoT). 'A local' means that the Global Problems of Time and Multiple Choice Problems of Time remain. On the other hand, Temporal, Configurational and Spacetime Relationalisms,

Constraint Closure, Beables, Foliation Dependence and Spacetime Reconstruction have been dealt with at the classical level. Whilst Kuchař commented that [39] the Halliwell–Hawking model would exhibit "a small flexibility to wiggle the instants" of the foliation, he did not provide any detailed results for the PoT in such models. This Article supplies some of those, and in doing so delineates how Refoliation Invariance and Spacetime Reconstruction nontriviality require the plain (rather than modewise) analysis. These two differ because mode expansions are of the spheres of homogeneity themselves. Thus, whereas one can refoliate FLRW spacetime in whatever other manner (paralleling Dirac's insight for Minkowski spacetime treated thus [26]), one cannot expect the modewise split to carry over to other foliations. Hence use of the modewise split amounts to an extra use of privileged structure.

In the slightly inhomogeneous cosmology arena, at the classical level the modewise approach leads to a timefunction that bears small corrections relative to the usual concept of cosmic time. These are Machian corrections due to their taking into account the effects of small inhomogeneities. This approach additionally involves passing to a reduced formulation. This reduced formulation [in particular (24, 47, 48, 52) arising] can be viewed as a classical precursor of Wada's approach [40] to quantization [21], as opposed to [21]'s own unreduced approach; see [37] for more details of these inter-relations. We also note that the modewise constraints behave in a perhaps unexpected manner as compared to the full GR constraints; in particular, there are two second-class pairs. We further provide this slightly inhomogeneous cosmology model with a set of basis beables out of which Kuchař beables can be constructed.

The Machian classical Frozen Formalism Problem resolution is broken at the quantum level [18]. However, its methodology can be started afresh at this level [41]. Furthermore, the difference between the two timestandards thus produced can itself be seen to be Machian (time is now emergent from *quantum* change). I provided this at the semiclassical quantum level for RPM's and minisuperspace models in [41, 42, 31] as preparation for doing so for slightly inhomogeneous cosmology in the present and forthcoming articles. Moreover, semiclassical approaches to the PoT rely on the WKB approximation, which requires its own further justification. One approach to this is that decohereing histories [43] provides such a regime. Histories, the semiclassical approach and timeless records inter-protect each other to a greater extent as a three-way combined scheme [44, 45, 17, 18, 4].

Some further interesting questions are as follows.
1) The following factorization of the strategizing occurs at the classical level. Dirac's algebroid addresses all of Constraint Closure, Foliation Dependence and Spacetime Reconstruction. On the other hand, resolving Best Matching gives also resolutions to Temporal Relationalism and Kuchař beables. Then which of this article's arguments and results about brackets carry over to the quantum level? And does such a factorization continue to apply in the case of slightly inhomogeneous cosmology at the semiclassical level?
2) Which subalgebra of functionals of the basis of Kuchař beables can be consistently promoted to quantum Kuchař beables?
3) A limitation of the current Article's mode by mode slightly inhomogeneous cosmology arena is that its perturbative split carries background split problems. These are not exactly the same as those documented for background Minkowski splits in quantum gravity, but some are similar. Nonperturbative midisuperspace models are better in this respect.
4) Another future direction is to push the present program to third-order workings. S, V, T decoupling ends here. Conventional cosmological calculations have been extended to this qualitatively more general case, albeit without semiclassical time emerging from its calculations.
5) Global Problems of Time affect multiple facets and multiple of the strategies considered in this Article. E.g. difficulties with choosing an 'everywhere-valid' timefunction, linear constraint resolution, beables, refoliation invariance resolution, spacetime reconstruction... This is why we say we provide a 'local' resolution of the PoT.
6) Multiple Choice Problems. Canonical equivalence of classical formulations of a theory [47] does not imply unitary equivalence of the quantizations of each. By this, different choices of timefunction can lead to inequivalent quantum theories. This also applies as regards choices of beables. This is why we say we provide 'a' local resolution of the PoT.

Acknowledgements I thank Julian Barbour, Jonathan Halliwell, Marc Lachièze-Rey and Flavio Mercati for discussions and John Barrow, Jeremy Butterfield, Malcolm MacCallum, Don Page and Reza Tavakol for helping me with my career.

References

[1] K.V. Kuchař, in *Proceedings of the 4th Canadian Conference on General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics* ed. G. Kunstatter, D. Vincent and J. Williams (World Scientific, Singapore 1992); C.J. Isham, in *Integrable Systems, Quantum Groups and Quantum Field Theories* ed. L.A. Ibort and M.A. Rodríguez (Kluwer, Dordrecht 1993), gr-qc/9210011.

[2] E. Anderson, in *Classical and Quantum Gravity: Theory, Analysis and Applications* ed. V.R. Frignanni (Nova, New York 2011), arXiv:1009.2157.

[3] E. Anderson, Invited Review in Annalen der Physik, **524** 757 (2012), arXiv:1206.2403.

[4] E. Anderson, arXiv:1111.1472.

[5] E. Anderson, arXiv:1310.1524.

[6] J.A. Wheeler, in *Battelle Rencontres: 1967 Lectures in Mathematics and Physics* ed. C. DeWitt and J.A. Wheeler (Benjamin, N.Y. 1968);

[7] B.S. DeWitt, Phys. Rev. **160** 1113 (1967).

[8] C. Lanczos, *The Variational Principles of Mechanics* (University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1949).

[9] C.W. Misner, in *Magic Without Magic: John Archibald Wheeler* ed. J. Klauder (Freeman, San Francisco 1972).

[10] R.F. Baierlein, D. Sharp and J.A. Wheeler, Phys. Rev. **126** 1864 (1962).

[11] J.B. Barbour, B.Z. Foster and N. Ó Murchadha, Class. Quant. Grav. **19** 3217 (2002), gr-qc/0012089.

[12] E. Anderson and F. Mercati, arXiv:1311.6541.

[13] G.M. Clemence, Rev. Mod. Phys. **29** 2 (1957).

[14] J.B. Barbour and B. Bertotti, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. **A382** 295 (1982).

[15] J.A. Wheeler, in *Groups, Relativity and Topology* ed. B.S. DeWitt and C.M. DeWitt (Gordon and Breach, N.Y. 1963).

[16] E.P. Belasco and H.C. Ohanian, J. Math. Phys. **10** 1503 (1969); R. Bartnik and G. Fodor, Phys. Rev. **D48** 3596 (1993); G. Fodor, "The Thin Sandwich Conjecture" (Ph.D. Thesis, Budapest 1995).

[17] E. Anderson, Class. Quant. Grav. **29** 235015 (2012), arXiv:1204.2868.

[18] E. Anderson, Invited seminar at the 'Do we need a Physics of Passage' Conference at Cape Town, December 2012, arXiv:1306.5816.

[19] E. Anderson, Class. Quant. Grav. **25** 175011 (2008), arXiv:0711.0288.

[20] E. Anderson, *Problem of Time between General Relativity and Quantum Mechanics*, forthcoming Book.

[21] J.J. Halliwell and S.W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. **D31**, 1777 (1985).

[22] W. Rindler, *Relativity. Special, General and Cosmological* (Oxford University Press, Oxford 2001).

[23] C. Kiefer, *Quantum Gravity* (Clarendon, Oxford 2012).

[24] C. Kiefer, Class. Quant. Grav. **4**, 1369 (1987); C. Kiefer and T.P. Singh, Phys. Rev. **D44** 1067 (1991); C. Kiefer and M. Krämer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108** 021301 (2012); D. Bini *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D87**, 104008 (2013), arXiv:1303.0531.

[25] Inflation is supported by the latest experimental data: Planck: P.A.R. Ade et al., arXiv:1303.5082; BICEP: J.B. Dent, L.M. Krauss and H. Mathur, arXiv:1403.5166.

[26] P.A.M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics* (Yeshiva University, New York 1964).

[27] E. Anderson, Invited Review for S.I.G.M.A., arXiv:1312.6073.

[28] C. Teitelboim, Ann. Phys. N.Y. **79** 542 (1973).

[29] S.A. Hojman, K.V. Kuchař and C. Teitelboim, Ann. Phys. N.Y. **96** 88 (1976).

[30] J.S. Bell, in *Quantum Gravity 2. A Second Oxford Symposium* ed. C.J. Isham, R. Penrose and D.W. Sciama (Clarendon, Oxford, 1981).

[31] E. Anderson, arXiv:1307.1916.

[32] C. Rovelli, fqxi 'Nature of Time' Essay Competition: Community First Prize, arXiv:0903.3832.

[33] J.B. Barbour, fqxi 'Nature of Time' Essay Competition: Juried First Prize, arXiv:0903.3489.

[34] E. Anderson, arXiv:1209.1266.

[35] V. Fock, Z. Phys. **98** 148 (1935).

[36] U.H. Gerlach and U.K. Sengupta, Phys. Rev **D18** 1773 (1978).

[37] E. Anderson, "Configuration Space Geometry in Slightly Inhomogeneous Cosmology", forthcoming.

[38] J.A. Wheeler, in *Problems in the Foundations of Physics* ed. N. Toraldo di Francia and B. van Fraassen (North Holland, Amsterdam 1979).

[39] K.V. Kuchař, in *The Arguments of Time*, ed. J. Butterfield (Oxford University Press, Oxford 1999).

[40] S. Wada, preprint UT Komaba85-8 (1985); Nucl. Phys. **B276** 729 (1986); Erratum-ibid. **B284** 747 (1987); Phys. Rev. **D34** 2272 (1986); I. Shirai and S. Wada, "Cosmological Perturbations and Quantum Fields in Curved Space", Nucl. Phys. **B303** 728 (1988).

[41] E. Anderson, Class. Quant. Grav. **31** (2014) 025006, arXiv:1305.4685.

[42] E. Anderson and S.A.R. Kneller, "Relational Quadrilateralland. II. The Quantum Theory", Accepted by Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D**, arXiv:1303.5645.

[43] J.B. Hartle, in *Gravitation and Quantizations: Proceedings of the 1992 Les Houches Summer School* ed. B. Julia and J. Zinn-Justin (North Holland, Amsterdam 1995), gr-qc/9304006; C.J. Isham and N. Linden, J. Math. Phys. **36** 5392 (1995), gr-qc/9503063.

[44] J.J. Halliwell, in *The Future of Theoretical Physics and Cosmology (Stephen Hawking 60th Birthday Festschrift Volume)* ed. G.W. Gibbons, E.P.S. Shellard and S.J. Rankin (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2003), gr-qc/0208018.

[45] J.J. Halliwell, Phys. Rev. **D80** 124032 (2009), arXiv:0909.2597; J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **306** 012023 (2011), arXiv:1108.5991.

[46] M. Bojowald, plenary talk given at Multicosmofun '12, Szeczin, Poland, arXiv:1212.5150.

[47] M.J. Gotay, in *Mechanics: From Theory to Computation (Essays in Honor of Juan-Carlos Simó* ed J. Marsden and S. Wiggins, J. Nonlinear Sci. Eds. **171** (Springer, New York 2000), math-ph/9809011.